FILED

FEB 1 1 2008

DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION OF THE

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA

IN THE MATTER OF A MEMBER)	Nos.	06-1221, 05-0749, 05-0778
OF THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA,)		
)		
EDMUND D. KAHN,)		
Bar No. 002152)	DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION	
)	REPO	ORT
RESPONDENT.)		

This matter came before the Disciplinary Commission of the Supreme Court of Arizona on January 12, 2008, pursuant to Rule 58, Ariz.R.Sup.Ct., for consideration of the Hearing Officer's Report filed October 10, 2007, recommending a six-month and one-day suspension, compliance with Rule 72, one year of probation with the State Bar's Law Office Management Assistance Program (LOMAP), completion of the State Bar's Professional Ethics Enhancement Course prior to reinstatement, and costs. Respondent filed an objection and requested oral argument. Respondent and counsel for the State Bar were present.

Respondent asserts that he has committed no violations involving moral turpitude and the record supports only a sanction of informal reprimand or censure. Respondent further asserts that when he filed his Rule 72(e) Affidavit in Arizona, his information was incorrect, but he did not make deliberate falsehoods about his membership status in New York or New Mexico. Respondent maintains that a suspension at his age would have the same effect as disbarment and that the recommended sanction does not fulfill the purposes of discipline.

The State Bar concurs with the Hearing Officer's findings and conclusions and urges the Commission to impose a sanction of no less than six-months and one-day. The State Bar asserts that Respondent should be required to demonstrate rehabilitation and fitness to practice through formal reinstatement proceedings.

Decision

The eight members¹ of the Disciplinary Commission unanimously recommend accepting and incorporating the majority of the Hearing Officer's findings of fact and conclusions of law but modify *de novo* the recommended sanction to reflect a three-year suspension, compliance with Rule 72, one year of probation (LOMAP) upon reinstatement with specific terms to be determined at the time of reinstatement, completion of the Professional Ethics Enhancement Program (EEP) prior to reinstatement, and costs of these disciplinary proceedings.²

The Commission determined that on the facts in this matter, specifically Respondent's serious and long-term misrepresentations regarding his admission status, his repeated false statements made under oath to courts regarding his status, his complete failure to understand the egregiousness of his misconduct in regards to the client in Count Three, and his lack of remorse, a three-year suspension is warranted and necessary to protect the public.

The Commission further determined that the Hearing Officer erred in concluding that mitigating factor 9.32(a) absence of disciplinary record is present. See Hearing Officer's Report, p. 28. In addition, the Commission notes that it is inappropriate to consider the adverse impact on the individual respondent of a sanction needed to protect

Commissioner Baran did not participate in these proceedings.

² A copy of the Hearing Officer's Report is attached as Exhibit A.

the public, the profession, the administration of justice and instill public confidence in the Bar's integrity. See In re Shannon, 179 Ariz. 52, 876 P.2d 548 (1994). RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 144 day of February 2008. Daisy Flores Nice-Chair **Disciplinary Commission** Original filed with the Disciplinary Clerk this /141 day of February, 2008. Copy of the foregoing mailed this // day of fell war C. Eileen Bond Hearing Officer 7N 122 North Cortez Street, Suite 320 Prescott, AZ 85301-3023 Edmund D. Kahn Respondent 7469 E. Broadway, Suite A Tucson, AZ 85710-0001 and Edmund D. Kahn Respondent 1891 Kingswood Drive Prescott, AZ 86305 Edward W. Parker Bar Counsel State Bar of Arizona 4201 North 24th Street, Suite 200 Phoenix, AZ \$5016-6288

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

/mps